

Washington 13th August 1858
Jas G Booth Esq
Phila

Dear Sir

I recd your letter of the 13th which is so especially explanatory upon the suggestions I made about your invention. The language of the first item of claim is "The process of dissolving alloyed Gold by the use of common Salt, Nitrate of Soda or Potassa and Sulphuric acid." &c. which I suppose is comprehensive enough; the terms for refining are not used in the branch of the claim, and that is the reason why I suggested the 4th claim for the process of refining alloyed gold without the use of Silver So as to form a solution of Gold " &c. This I think comes all right. Yesterday I wrote to your saying in effect that the whole authority for changing the rate of charges for refining at the Mint is by the act of Congress of the 18th Jan'y 1837 Sect 8th with the sanction and requisition of the concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury. Now the plan which I propose is that they should let the Secretary to address a letter to the Secy saying that you have proposed a new available and economical plan for refining Gold with Quamphole Mercuric chloride of Phila for refining Gold at a cost for labor and materials to the Mint of 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ cts per oz including the charge of the proprietors for the use of their invention & that it is a material in the art; and saying that with the concurrence of the Secretary the rate of charges will be reduced from the present sum of 5 cts to 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ cts per oz. That the terms upon which the proprietors propose to let the Mint at Phila have the use of the invention are, that they shall receive all over the actual expenses to the Mint of the Machinery & labor employed for refining the Gold not exceeding 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ cts per oz: or in other words all but in the actual expenses to the Mint of the Machinery & labor are the sum of

3 1/2 cts to be charged to the Secretary, and the contract to be made
to a contract for the term of 20 years unless a cheaper rate
shall be the means to be established.

As the laws seem to require the change to be made by the Director
and only to be concurred in by the Secretary, it is proposed that you
should advise the Director of this, which you can do by reading
when the 18 Decr of the Law I have mentioned, and then
getting him to write such a letter as I advise.

The whole affair now is within a very
small & easy compass and if you work persistently you
can have your invention introduced at once.

I have my letter to the Secy all ready
to present, but as I am convinced that the Secretary
should be with the Director, I have delayed & shall
delay a few days. Altogether omit to present it unless
in what I hear from you, the Director may not
wish to make the first move. I think however of the
Law has provided him out as the originator of any
necessary change - he should not hesitate to depart
that it can be advantageously made.

Since that the Secy has no authority
to make a proposal of the right to the Govt. and as the
change is only to include materials (of which you patented
right of use & have one the Director would recommend
a new change upon the recommendation of the Director
the committee for the time being you place into fruitful
operation if concurred in by the Secretary. The letter which
I have prepared will nevertheless be important in the
future to show when & how cheap you offered to
under take the refining. If it is not used as now

Addressed to the Secy you may make it the foundation of
your application in the application itself to the Director by
merely changing the address, and I will forward it to
the Secretary as part of his action, was one of the causes
of this action in making the change as they for the
Secretary's convenience.

Observe, I have placed a flat fee for refining,
at 5 pcts to be considered as 10 pcts of the cost of the
By this then the cost will be 5 pcts of the cost of the
5 1/2 pcts to be nearly 2 cts per oz of the
In process 14 pcts per material.

then for labor	1.5/10
5 1/2 pcts per oz	5 1/2 pcts per oz

Which could not appear I should think to refine in 3 1/2 cts because
it would afford him a profit of only 2 pcts of a cent per oz unless
for the sake of pride he would agree to under take it without
any profit & if this you must take care, for as you can
afford to do it for still less than 3 1/2 you must reflect
whether you will not close at possibility of competi-
tion by proposing the lowest sum.

Thus if you 14 pcts process with Salt, nit Soda,
a vit am sulph. I. is employed & the cost will be 8 pcts per oz
for materials; & for labor

1.5/10	3 pcts per oz
which would make you to offer to refine in 13 pcts per oz	
as a material (more this) at 7 pcts of a cent per oz & still allow	
the Secretary to be required to 3 cts per oz	

If however you offer nothing to be added then
the cost of materials would be 1.5/10
labor 1.5

Cost of the material of your invention to be	8/10
when & considered as such.	3 1/2/10

13. Aug. 1850

El. M. Morfit

Washington

This must be only 4/10 of a cent on the cent by Mr. P. H. &
of 9 in value that he would not expect to see in a profit of
nearly 4/10 of a cent per oz then I would offer at 3 1/4 cts.

It however the silliness by any or any other process
is an insuperable objection, then I would propose at 3 1/4
cts for the charge to depositors & you to bear the difference
between that & the cost of materials & labor as the value
cost of your invention as a material. I see the word
material because it is not employed by the law.

I annex a clause the form of such a letter
as you may propose to Mr. P. H. to send to the Secy

I shall be glad to hear from you as soon
as possible as I shall not do any thing with the
letter I have until I hear from you, & indeed
as the cause pressed out by the act of Congress is
so clear & requires the change of charge to be made
by the Secy. I hope there will be no difficulty in
your getting him to pursue that plan. I must go on
to the end of your letter. Respo
thought it worth the
trouble & expense. I am, Sir,
Henry M. Morfit

In the above I have not contemplated your services
as any part of the labor intended to be charged for under
the law — if it were it would make a difference
in the cost — but I take it for granted it alludes to
construction to mean only labor in the physical
sense of the term.